Mitigation that Works
April 15, 2008 Meeting Summary

Introductions and Opening

Elizabeth McManus welcomed Forum members and then reviewed the agenda for the day. *(See Attachment 1 for meeting agenda)* Topics included:

- A brief overview of the new Federal Mitigation Rule;
- a discussion of watershed based planning as an approach to mitigation, including review and refinement of draft recommendations;
- a discussion of potential tools to support watershed based mitigation; and,
- a review of remaining draft recommendations to date.

Federal Mitigation Rule

Muffy Walker provided a brief overview of the Joint Army-EPA Mitigation Rule. *(See Attachment 2 for presentation slides.)* She described the following highlights:

- The goal of the new rule is to level the playing field among various approaches to mitigation, including: permittee mitigation, mitigation banks and in-lieu fee (ILF), to the maximum extent practicable.
- The rule stresses increased compliance visits, and the need to establish enforceable success criteria and monitoring and reporting requirements.
- The rule preserves the mitigation sequence and does not change when mitigation is required.
- Benefits of the rule include:
    - Greater predictability and transparency
    - Improved planning and site selection
    - Flexibility of mitigation options
    - Strongly encourages a watershed approach and using available watershed planning information
- The rule includes a preference hierarchy for mitigation options:
    - Mitigation bank credits
    - In-lieu fee program credits
    - Permittee-responsible mitigation under a watershed approach
    - On-site and/or in-kind permittee-responsible mitigation
    - Off-site and/or out-of-kind permittee-responsible mitigation
- Principles in the final rule include:
    - District-engineer is the decision-maker
    - Long-term management may be transferred to another entity
    - Ecologically-driven performance standards
    - Adaptive management

A Forum member asked how in-lieu fee was treated differently under the new rule. Muffy noted that there would be more rigor around in-lieu fee programs and that the Corps would probably be looking closely at King County's in-lieu fee program as an example. She explained that the rule requires in-lieu fee programs to meet the same requirements as banking efforts. She noted that there is strong enforcement component for ILF and that there are much more specific requirements for a permittee particularly around monitoring and financial assurances. Given the stronger correlation between banks

and ILF in the new federal rule, it was suggested that the Forum might consider lessons learned in the banking process when making recommendations on ILF.

Muffy further noted that she did not anticipate a difficult transition from the old rules to the new rule as this region currently engages in many of the practices highlighted in the new rule. She explained that the bigger changes regarding financial assurances and long-term management would require a greater effort to determine an approach. A Forum member asked how the public would be informed of the development of new approaches under the rule. Muffy responded that public outreach in part would be based on the approaches selected. She noted that it could be in the form of guidance, public notice, workshops and through websites. Muffy suggested that the Forum effort could be useful in transitioning to the new rule by providing recommendations/guidance on using a watershed approach to mitigation. Specifically, how to tie efforts into existing watershed plans and identifying what other information might be needed.

Watershed Based Mitigation

The Forum then continued its ongoing discussion of a watershed based approach to mitigation. Members began the discussion by reviewing the "Draft Report and Recommendations Outline" *(See Attachment 3 for outline).* The outline starts with the notion that a key element of a successful vision is watershed based mitigation and that certain characteristics and outcomes would help define what a successful watershed based approach would look like. The Forum will need to make sure that it can ratify a watershed based approach and ensure that the characteristics and outcomes are defined correctly.

Regarding the Shared Vision for Successful Mitigation, Forum members had the following comments:

- 2.b.iii. *Replaces Lost Function* – Replacing lost function is not necessarily better for overall watershed health. Sometimes the function lost might be of marginal value while there are other functions that might be of higher value to the watershed. A solid rule of function replacing function might decrease the value of using a watershed approach.
- 2.b.v. *Integrated* –
    - There should be a range or scale regarding how and when integration of multiple resources and regulatory requirements should occur. If an integrated approach is not the best or most efficient for a given situation, it should not be a requirement.
    - There should be integration on the process side, such as coordination among agencies and among the regulatory processes to improve the transparency of and efficiency of the process.
    - Recommendation should include a statement referring to agreement on mitigation tools across local, state and federal jurisdictions.
- 2.b.vi. *Efficient and Flexible* – Should incorporate streamlining the mitigation determination process.
- 2.b.vii. *Measurable and Measured* – Needs to be clear that we need to know what we are really losing and what we are really gaining through mitigation efforts.
- 2.b.ix. – *Other* – Another important characteristic of a watershed-based approach should be that it encourages growth in a way that makes the highest and best use of land, balancing the built and natural resources. We want to encourage development to happen where it's planned, but verify that growth is planned in the right places within a watershed.
- 2.c. *Results/Outcomes* –

- *i.* – "full replacement" should get at the idea that replacement might be of the particular function lost or, if appropriate, of a different function that is more important to the ecosystem/watershed
- *iii.* – This section should describe how a watershed approach allows for investments in the right places. It should make clear the benefits of a watershed approach versus straight on-site, in-kind mitigation
- *v.* – Should be clear that not only do local planners have more tools/options to recommend to developers, but that they also have the authority and incentives to improve and make use of those tools
- *vi.* – Make this statement more affirmative that mitigation decisions/planning could occur at the plan level. For example, at the GMA and SMA plan level or programmatic mitigation approaches.

Forum members then considered the following questions:

- What would watershed based mitigation look like?
- How would we know if we were doing it?
- What characteristics and outcomes would define a watershed based approach?

A Forum member asked how watershed is defined when working in a marine environment. Other Forum members noted that the Puget Sound Partnership is beginning to address this question. Josh Baldi suggested that this be an area that the Forum address in its recommendations. Another Forum member suggested that a "watershed approach" is really about what makes the most biological sense. For example, actions that might make the most biological sense could reach across watersheds and in the marine environment, across an inlet.

A meeting participant suggested that the Forum consider the questions from both a biological and process perspective. A Forum member suggested that the Vision for successful mitigation should include a streamlined process as well as establishing information and improving tools. She suggested that the process itself be able to guide an applicant toward what tool would be the best and fastest in a given situation so that there is less time and decision-making spent on the options. Another Forum member suggested that any recommendations the Forum make not result in a slower process. She noted that even if better, more innovative approaches to mitigation are available, that an applicant will select the option that will result in the fastest decision. If the process to achieving a decision is more time consuming for off-site mitigation, an applicant will select the more tradition on-site, in-kind approach. Josh Baldi responded that it's difficult to measure "faster" and that the group should perhaps also think about process improvements in terms of efficiency and predictability.

Regarding the question, "what would watershed mitigation look like", Forum members identified the following:

- Biological test:
  - Are we replacing lost functions?
  - Are we getting collateral restoration?
- Process tests:
  - Do local permitting authorities have the information and options available?
    - At every front counter throughout the state, local jurisdictions would be able to address permittees with the following questions:

- Have you looked at the following sites? In essence, local permitting agencies would know where the receiving areas are in a given watershed and would be able to share that information with applicants.
- Have you considered a mitigation bank?
- Have you consider an ILF program?
- Here are the options, let's determine which makes the most sense for your project.

- Political boundaries are not a barrier, that is, if it makes most sense for mitigation to occur in a different city or town from the project impacts in the same watershed, this should be provided for. The Forum acknowledged that this could be a difficult issue, since some cities and towns want to preserve habitat by ensuring that mitigation occurs within their jurisdiction
- A web-based system should exist that identifies:
  - receiving areas
  - what biological functions exist or could exist in those areas
  - what mitigation banks and ILF programs are available
  - Ideally such a system would be interactive.

A Forum member noted that the Clark County effort is working on a system that would integrate existing information and provide that information in advance. She noted that there needs to be alignment between local, state and federal governments regarding what a system most needs and what approaches would work best. Another Forum member cautioned that there are land ownership issues in making information on potential receiving areas public. If land is privately held, it doesn't mean it is available for mitigation even thought it might provide the best site for the needed functions.

A Forum member reiterated that the issue of jurisdictional boundaries is a key impediment to higher quality mitigation and that the Forum needs to address it by engaging local governments and tribes on how to address this issue. He noted that in order to have such a discussion, the Forum would need to be able to articulate the benefits of a watershed based approach. Josh Baldi suggested that a small group (6-7 people) have a side discussion regarding how best to incorporate local and tribal governments. He volunteered himself and Chris Townsend as participants. It was suggested that the notion of community values also be incorporated into this discussion.

The Director of Ecology, Jay Manning, joined the meeting to participate in the discussion of "watershed based" mitigation. He began by thanking the group, noting his concern regarding the absence of cities and counties representatives at the meeting, and reiterating that the Forum is the group to make recommendations on improvements to the mitigation process and outcomes. In considering watershed characterizations, Jay suggested that a watershed characterization baseline be identified but to ensure that the required level of understanding be set at the right level to support decisions. He noted that while watershed characterizations are critical, there is always likely more information that could be gathered on any complex system such as a watershed; he suggested that a critical element of characterization is understanding what information is needed to support what types of decisions, acknowledging that some decisions may require more or different information than others.

Gordon White, Ecology, suggested that Ecology's draft standards for mitigation banks have some information on what types of watershed information is needed for banking decisions. Margaret noted that the Ecology has already done watershed characterizations for several counties (E.g, Whatcom, Snohomish, Clark, and Jefferson) and wondered if it was possible to take those completed

characterizations and then fill in relevant information for the remaining counties at least in the Puget Sound basin.

A Forum member suggested that it might be useful to identify a lead agency/entity to compile existing watershed information and examine gaps, if any. Another Forum member supported this concept noting that it builds accountability into the process. Another Forum member suggested however that the determination of a lead agency would seem to depend upon the project and project location.

A Forum member suggested that another way to approach information needs is to consider the features that the information should have. She suggested that there be necessary features of information in order to answer different types of questions. Margaret noted that the level of information needed in a watershed characterization depends upon the action that an agency and developer are considering.

The Forum discussed that often project proponents want to know early in a process that permitting authorities are able to pre-commit to off-site mitigation. A watershed approach supported by watershed based information should make it easier for agencies to do so in some form. Muffy Walker responded that the Corps cannot provide an absolute guarantee until a final approval document is signed. Ecology representatives suggested that the agencies could explore different mechanisms for how permitting, such as MOA's, programmatic agreements, etc. and that ideally watershed information could strengthen the Agencies ability to help project proponents confidently predict mitigation outcomes. The Agencies acknowledged that their ability to make firm commitments in advance of site-specific decisions is limited and complicated – but also expressed interest in exploring concepts to make these processes more transparent and to provide more predictability to project proponents.

A Forum member noted that once characterizations are defined and completed, there is still the issue of different permitting processes. She suggested that the decision makers need to align and integrate their levels of project/permit review. In addition to aligning processes, a meeting observer suggested that it is important for the state to develop a policy that parallels the new federal policy and states a preference for using a watershed approach – and for off-site options such as banking and ILF. He suggested that for staff to begin implementing a watershed based approach, they need both the necessary tools and incentives and a clearer overall policy direction/statement.

SEPA/GMA integration

The Forum discussed how watershed characterization information might relate to other planning processes, including whether local receiving areas identified during watershed characterization could be institutionalized as part of land use planning for a jurisdiction. If the receiving areas were reflected in comprehensive plans and zoning, for example, developers would have that information from the start of a project. A Forum member referenced the SEPA/GMA integration effort as a possible source of lessons learned around integration and planning tools. He suggested the possibility of incorporating watershed characterization as a mandatory tool in planning efforts. He noted that this would require significant investment of resources up front. A Forum member noted that developers will want to be assured of process improvements if they are going to invest resources up front. Another Forum member suggested looking at the Everett wetlands SEPA analysis as a useful model.

Doug Peters, CTED, noted that the Planning and Environmental Review Fund grant program provided resources for upfront SEPA analysis. He suggested that it might be useful to look at the 1997/1998 pilot program, in which six projects were funded. He noted that there was a report on the effort and that

additional funding has been requested in the past, but has not been forthcoming. Forum members noted it might be useful to know what worked and did not work about the pilot program.

Forum members then brainstormed potential actions required to move towards watershed based mitigation:

- Agencies can pre-commit to off-site mitigation that has some foundation in watershed based information. Requires a stronger foundation of information to support these decisions.
- In-lieu fee programs and advance mitigation create an opportunity to precommit, but don't necessarily commit to their use for a specific project
- Explore mechanisms for how agencies might be able to approach permitting when projects take advantage of pre-identified priority areas for mitigation/restoration (MOAs, general permits, programmatic)
- Identify who should be a lead on gathering watershed info – cities, counties, have to be on board; use ongoing efforts going towards cities (NPDES stuff) to help
- Template of information needed to support different types of decisions – level of info needed geared to the decision it will support
- Develop an inventory of the watershed information we currently have
- Figure out how to set the right bar for the necessary level of understanding of a watershed; what's really needed to support decisions; establish the right threshold (Perhaps begin with Ecology's draft standard for mitigation banks)
- Examine Snohomish, Clark, Whatcom, Leavenworth, Jefferson Counties characterizations and ask what we learned; King county characterization and Lewis County to happen soon. Is it possible to fill in the information for the remaining counties rather than creating a big new program for other entities to implement?
- Recommend specific areas for characterization to support specific decisions (E.g., The information required for determining where to locate a mitigation bank is different than the information required to change zoning)
- Describe the feature of information assessments must produce
- Address the challenge of different permitting systems at different levels of government: action = align those permit actions and reviews on a project scale / integrate project review. Define how to reach agreement that avoidance + minimization has been adequately considered so use of watershed information to identify off-site mitigation possibilities is triggered.
- Lead agency concept = whose making the decision, who is responsible for coordinating all the other agencies and lining them up. Timelines. Accountability. Could be different leads for different types of decisions depending on specifics of the project (pick an area to pilot?)
- Are there agencies who are involved now that could decide not to be involved in some types of decisions?
- Encourage staff to implement watershed based approach; encourage creativity at the staff level; apply watershed based approach to smaller scales; give staff the tools they need at permit-by-permit level at the smaller scale. Action: create preferences/policies, hierarchies, decision tools to favor watershed based approach. Create a State policy to match the new Federal policy.
- Dialogue w/ cities and counties and tribes to understand concerns about mitigation outside jurisdiction boundaries and address these concerns – some jurisdictions have restrictions some don't
- Describe benefits of watershed based mitigation

- What is the best way to address the community value dimension of watershed based characterization Action: define the issue, include in dialogue (above) or factor into characterization features
- Identify where watershed characterizations are complete enough to move forward. This would not necessarily mean that the development of information in those watersheds is complete, but that it is complete enough to be able to make some decisions.
- Identify those jurisdictions/watersheds where the characterizations are not at the level where decisions can be made and complete those characterizations
- Improve/streamline banking rules so that the State is encouraging the growth/use of the mitigation banking industry
- Develop a statewide In-lieu fee program supported by all relevant state agencies. He noted that there would need to be appropriate safeguards built into the program to ensure that there was accountability and that the desired results were being achieved.
- Commit state, locals and tribes to a multi-agency permitting team. The team would work with developers to identify the best type of mitigation for an identified project. He suggested it be based on the DOT model, but expanded and not limited to DOT projects. He noted that it would be useful to have a threshold for determining when such a multi-agency team would be required. For example, if a project requires and EIS then the multi-agency team would be included in the mitigation planning effort. A Forum member noted that there is an effort in Marysville that is working on such a review process and that perhaps such a structure could be based on geographic areas instead of project by project.
- Develop, and implement training program for developers, local permit writers, etc.
- Compliance, enforcement, adaptation, repair of projects that aren't working
- Define criteria for pre commitments (e.g., as part of ILF program creation)

Potential Tools for Watershed Based Mitigation

Off-site/On0site Decision Making Tool, Kim Harper, Department of Ecology (See Attachment 4 for presentation slides)

Kim explained that she would be presenting draft guidance on choosing mitigation sites using a watershed approach. She noted that development of the guidance is an ongoing effort by a workgroup comprised of Ecology, Corps and EPA. She explained that the draft guidance is still a work in progress and focuses solely on site selection, not project design. She also explained that the guidance is technically driven and when completed will require a policy overlay.

The goals for the guidance are:

- Define what a watershed approach means, technically
- Shift focus of mitigation process to restoring watershed processes (what processes influence different watershed functions)
- Provide a practical tool for site selection
- Improve mitigation success

The guidance is intended to help in site selection and to support local, state and federal reviewers to help them determine if they used a watershed approach and how.

Kim explained that the guidance addresses two paths: 1.) where an appropriate watershed plan exists; and, 2) where lacking an appropriate watershed plan. She noted that the guidance focuses on wetland mitigation, but could be applied to other aquatic resources.

Key points of the guidance include:

- Mitigation should be located to restore watershed processes as much as possible
- We need to do watershed assessments/plans at a regional scale not on a project scale
- Assessments/plans should target priority wetland restoration areas and lay out goals for those areas
- When watershed assessment is not available for an area, can use simpler tools that are grounded in the same principles
- On-site mitigation is appropriate when it addresses watershed processes and it shows potential for being successful and sustainable
- Watershed approach does not change the need to avoid impacts to irreplaceable wetlands
- Mitigation programs should be based on a watershed approach
- Use of approach may result in out-of-kind mitigation when it is ecologically preferable to in-kind. The watershed plan prioritizes the need.

A Forum member asked how functions of an impacted site are taken into account. Kim explained that the first step is to look at the processes that need to be restored and that these processes should drive the choices for mitigation instead of the functions. She noted that the guidance puts a watershed overlay on first before looking at the functions being lost. Another Forum member asked about the ratios for replacing functions in light of project impacts. She noted that the guidance doesn't seem to address that issue. Kim responded that the guidance is still working within the existing ration guidelines. A Forum member noted that the process would require ensuring that the right mechanisms are in place to measure functions versus processes. For example, how much of specific processes get the functions that are being impacted.

Kim reviewed features of a good watershed plan. They include:

- Identifies areas in a watershed that are important to ecological processes
- Assesses level of alternation of processes
- Identifies priority areas for protection and restoration
- Sets restoration goals for priority areas
- Discusses types of restoration actions that could address process restoration
- Is not focused on a single species

A Forum member challenged the last point regarding "not focused on a single species." She noted that information shouldn't be discounted because it focuses on a specific species. She noted that it's most important to look at the scientific underpinning of a plan.

Another Forum member asked where the watershed information might be found. Kim explained that there are various sources on information, noting that they are not all found in one location. Sources of information include:

- Soil surveys
- Geology maps
- Climate maps
- NOAA

- NRCS
- Counties
- Department of Ecology

Kim then reviewed the decision making path for when a watershed plan exists and when it does not. A Forum member noted that the decision-making process as described doesn't seem very useful for the average applicant. He wondered whether it actually increased regulatory requirements. Margaret noted that there are essentially two parts to the process identified in the guidance. The first is the characterization step, which only needs to be done once and represents a regional investment. The second is the decision-making pathways, which are a tool to help make sure the right questions are asked and answered.

Kim noted that the guidance pushes a shift in mitigation policy

Old	New
Avoid whenever possible	Restore watershed processes whenever possible
Mitigation on-site if possible	Mitigation where process restoration will be effective and sustainable
Replace with similar functions to impact wetland	Use watershed plan to prioritize processes and functions to be restored
Site selection driven primarily by applicants' needs at project level	Site selection driven primarily by watershed needs and planning at regional level
Mitigate within jurisdiction	Mitigate where watershed plan shows the need

Josh Baldi asked if the workgroup would consider possible policy questions, options and preferences and share them with the Forum.

Shared Strategy Mitigation Site Analysis, Dennis Canty, Evergreen Funding Associates (See Attachment5 for presentation slides)

Dennis introduced himself and suggested that in order to achieve better results from mitigation efforts, there should be a focus on greater effectiveness in a greater number of cases. In relation to his equation of 100% performance=100% effectiveness + 100% of cases, he suggested that perhaps the Forum was too focused on the effective approaches side of the equation. He noted that instead of tools that might be useful in a limited number of cases, that the Forum also focus on tools that can be applied in a greater number of circumstances.

Dennis explained that the Shared Strategy became interested in mitigation when it was exploring possible sources of funding for salmon recovery projects. Part of that exploration was to identify how money is spent on the environment in Washington State, which identified mitigation as a major source of environmental spending. Dennis noted that: looked at mitigation and developed the site analysis tool as a result of an examination that:

- The state averages 10-15% of total capital spending (or >$250M/yr in the Puget Sound) on project-related environmental mitigation
- There are indications that this money could be better spent, that is, that mitigation less than fully successful >50% of the time

Shared Strategy then explored whether restoration sites from the salmon plans could play a role in improving mitigation.

Working with Parametrix, they created a site assessment tool. The tool is a rapid screening characterization that allows watershed planners to evaluate potential mitigation sites with current information. Often, sites/projects identified in the salmon recovery plans could offer multiple benefits beyond salmon recovery, including mitigation benefits. The screening tool allow for a rapid initial evaluation of these potential benefits, to identify which, if any, projects from the salmon recovery plans might be serve as mitigation projects. A Forum member asked what kind of applicant might use the site analysis tool. Dennis responded that the tool has wide-spread application and isn't just restricted to big developers. The tool:

- Describes a broad group of restorable resources that may have mitigation value (The resources evaluated include: wetlands, salmonid habitat, riparian zones, stormwater/floodwater storage, water quality, marine shoreline)
- Evaluates quality and quantity at the current time and after restoration
- Identifies choices in how to restore the site
- Can be applied to any restoration project

Dennis noted that for applicants, it can be used as a screening tool to identify sites with resources needed for mitigation. For watershed planners it highlights the high-quality restoration sites. He explained that basic steps of the tool:

- Watershed leads identify the full range of resources on the site
- Ranking criteria are used to identify resource quality pre- and post-restoration
- The surrounding landscape is evaluated using other criteria
- A scoresheet is prepared
- Ideally, rating sheets are added to a regional database and mapping utility

Dennis explained that the tool has been field tested. He noted that it's been applied to 75 restoration sites in two watersheds and seems useful in identifying and evaluating resources. Overall findings include:

- While sites may be selected for salmon recovery benefits, many offer other restoration potential
- This tool is a useful way to quickly screen restoration sites for mitigation potential
- Could open up additional supply of high-quality mitigation sites

A Forum member asked if the Shared Strategy envisioned this as just a prescreening tool or if it considered doing additional assessments. Dennis responded that testing of the tool focused on 100% application in Puget Sound but that there are many ways to improve upon the tool. Another Forum member wondered how this tool addressed the nexus issue of having mitigation close to the development project. Dennis noted that there is a significant emphasis in local jurisdictions for keeping mitigation in "their own backyard." He suggested that it might be difficult to begin with off-site, out-of kind transactions. Josh Baldi noted that the site analysis tool identifies some good sites to be considered for mitigation, but that regulatory agencies would assess function/impact of development, not the tool itself.

Margaret Clancy noted that the one way in which the site analysis tool could be more powerful is using it in conjunction with watershed characterizations. A project component could look at a

characterization and know what areas are high priority in a watershed and then using the screening tool to identify the potential sites/projects available in the high priority area that address multiple benefits.

A Forum member reminded the group that it would be critical to answer how much watershed characterization is enough and how should it be used. Another Forum member suggested that the first step is to ask what kind of questions need to be answered. The next step would be to identify the types of information required to answer those questions. Another Forum member noted that it's also important to incorporate certain levels of confidence. She noted that some decisions might require more information to achieve the right confidence level, particularly with off-site mitigation.

A Forum member noted that the new federal mitigation rule emphasizes first, site selection on a watershed basis and that it seems to make a permittee responsible for justifying why on-site.in-kind might be better than using a mitigation bank or ILF program. In essence, as a matter of federal policy it might now actually be harder to say on-site, in-kind is better. Margaret noted that while the new federal rule is an important step in saying there is not a preference for on-site in-kind, the rule does seem to make ILF more difficult as there are now more requirements. A meeting observer noted that the rule doesn't seem to say exhaust the list of preferred tools (I.e., banks, ILF); it focuses more on selecting mitigation sites based on a watershed approach. This might be on-site, in-kind.

Forum members suggested developing a sliding scale regarding questions that need to be answered and the information required to answer those questions. For example, what decisions need to be made with what confidence level? Then, what information is required to answer the questions with the right level of confidence. Does the necessary information already exist? If not, what information do we need? The scale would represent the information thresholds required for certain types of decisions. Forum members asked the project support team to develop this sliding scale and present it at the next Forum meeting.

Wrap-up

The group then briefly reviewed the topics for its May meeting.
The topics for the May meeting are:

- May:
    - Discussion of what types of information associated with watershed "characterization" might support various levels of decisions
    - Continue discussion on recommendation outline.

Next Steps

- Project support team will get in touch with remaining Forum members regarding the draft recommendations.
- Project support team will develop/refine recommendations based on Forum discussion.
- Project support team will develop a tiered approach to demonstrate what levels of information might be needed to support various levels of decisions.
- The next Mitigation Forum meeting is May20, 2008 and will be held in Olympia (Location to be determined)

Attending Forum Members

Josh Baldi, Washington State Department of Ecology
Jessi Belston, Washington Public Ports
Allison Butcher, Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties

Margen Carlson, (for Tim Smith, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife)
Michelle Connor, Cascade Land Conservancy
Rich Doenges, Washington State Department of Natural Resources
Faith Lumsden, Governor's Office of Regulatory Assistance
Doug Peters, Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development
Dave Remlinger, Skykomish Habitat, LLC
Jodi Slavik, Building Industry Association of Washington
Chris Townsend, Puget Sound Partnership
Muffy Walker, US Army Corps of Engineers
Megan White, Washington State Department of Transportation

Forum Members Not in Attendance
Dee Arntz, Washington Wetlands Network
Jim Fox, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office
Mike Grayum, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
John Grettenberger, US Fish and Wildlife
Rahi Gupta, Association of Washington Counties
Bob Kelly, Nooksack Tribe
Steve Landino, NOAA Fisheries
Chris McCabe, Association of Washington Business
Andy Meyer, Association of Washington Cities
Bill Robinson, The Nature Conservancy
Michael Szerlog, Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
Ron Shultz, Washington State Conservation Commission
Rick Slunaker, Associated General Contractors of Washington
John Stuhlmiller, Washington Farm Bureau

Guest Speakers/Participants
Dennis Canty, Evergreen Funding Consultants
Kim Harper, Washington State Department of Ecology

Audience Members
Wendy Bolender
Lauren Driscoll, Washington State Department of Ecology
Bill Leonard, Washington State Department of Transportation
Don Stuart, American Farmland Trust
Jeannie Summerhays, Washington State Department of Ecology
Jim Weber, NWIFC
Gordon White, Washington State Department of Ecology

Project Support Team
Margaret Clancy, ESA Adolfson
Elizabeth Mc Manus, Ross & Associates
Megan Duffy, Ross & Associates